



November 12, 2002

Ms. Jan Clark
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
Legal Department
P.O. Box 1562
Houston, Texas 77251-1562

OR2002-6395

Dear Ms. Clark:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 172039.

The Houston Police Department (the "department") received a request for information regarding the homicide of George David Tedesco on January 11, 1979, the burglary of George David Tedesco's residence on January 28, 1978, the arrest of Tommy David Bell for that burglary, and the death of Tommy David Bell in May 1980. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.108 and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

We must first address the department's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government. Pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body is required to submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) general written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. Whether a submission is timely is determined by section 552.308, which provides in pertinent part:

(a) When this subchapter requires a request, notice, or other document to be submitted or otherwise given to a person within a specified period . . . the requirement is met if the document is sent to the person by first class United States mail *properly addressed* with postage prepaid and:

- (1) it bears a post office cancellation mark indicating a time within that period; or
- (2) the person required to submit or otherwise give the document furnishes satisfactory proof that it was deposited in the mail within that period.

Gov't Code § 552.308(a) (emphasis added). You state that the department received the present request on August 21, 2002. The requested information was submitted to this office along with a letter dated September 12, 2002, and was received by this office via Federal Express on September 13, 2002, which was sixteen business days after the date on which department received the present request. As this submission was not received via United States mail and did not bear a post office cancellation mark indicating that it was mailed prior to September 13, 2002, we find that the department failed to submit the requested information for our review within the fifteen-business-day deadline set forth in section 552.301(e).

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.--Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). You have not demonstrated a compelling reason to withhold the information under section 552.108. *But see* Open Records Decision No. 586 (1991) (need of another governmental body to withhold information from disclosure provides compelling reason under section 552.108). As sections 552.101, 552.119, 552.130, and 552.136 of the Government Code provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address the applicability of these exceptions to the submitted information.¹

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Section 552.101 encompasses common-law privacy. The doctrine of common-law privacy protects information if it is highly intimate or embarrassing such that its release would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and the public has no legitimate interest in it. *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault,

¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception like section 552.101, section 552.119, or section 552.136 on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. This office has determined that common-law privacy protects the following information: the kinds of prescription drugs a person is taking, *see* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987); the results of mandatory urine testing, *see id.*; illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps of applicants, *see id.*; the fact that a person attempted suicide, *see* Open Records Decision No. 422 (1984); and information regarding drug overdoses, acute alcohol intoxication, obstetrical/gynecological illnesses, convulsions/seizures, or emotional/mental distress, *see* Open Records Decision No. 343 (1982). Further, prior decisions of this office have found that personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is protected by common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990). The submitted information contains such intimate information and personal financial information that is not of legitimate concern to the public. We have marked the information in the submitted documents that must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We also note that the submitted documents contain social security numbers that may be excepted from public disclosure. A social security number may be withheld in some circumstances under section 552.101 in conjunction with the 1990 amendments to the federal Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I). *See* Open Records Decision No. 622 (1994). These amendments make confidential social security numbers and related records that are obtained and maintained by a state agency or political subdivision of the state pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990. *See id.* We have no basis for concluding that the social security numbers in the responsive records are confidential under section 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I), and therefore excepted from public disclosure under section 552.101 of the Public Information Act (the "Act") on the basis of that federal provision. We caution, however, that section 552.352 of the Act imposes criminal penalties for the release of confidential information. Prior to releasing any social security number information, you should ensure that no such information was obtained or is maintained by the department pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990.

Section 552.101 also encompasses constitutional rights of privacy. Constitutional privacy protects two kinds of interests. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5 (1992), 478 at 4 (1987), 455 at 3-7 (1987); *see also Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589, 599-600 (1977). The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the "zones of privacy," pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education, that have been recognized by the United States Supreme Court. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 3-7 (1987); *see also Fadjo v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1981). The second constitutionally protected privacy interest is in freedom from public disclosure of certain personal matters. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 6-7 (1987); *see also Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985), *reh'g denied*, 770 F.2d 1081 (1985), *cert. denied*, 474 U.S. 1062 (1986). The scope of information protected under constitutional privacy is narrower than under the common-law

doctrine of privacy; the information must concern "the most intimate aspects of human affairs." Open Records Decision No. 455 at 8 (1987) (quoting *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village*, 765 F.2d at 492). The submitted information includes an inmate's visitor information. Such information, which we have marked, is protected by constitutional privacy and must be withheld under section 552.101. See Open Records Decision No. 430 (1985) (list of inmate's visitors protected by constitutional law); cf. Open Records Decision No. 428 (1985) (list of inmate's correspondents protected by constitutional privacy).

Section 552.101 also encompasses information protected by statutes. Section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code provides as follows:

(a) A polygraph examiner, trainee, or employee of a polygraph examiner, or a person for whom a polygraph examination is conducted or an employee of the person, may not disclose information acquired from a polygraph examination to another person other than:

- (1) the examinee or any other person specifically designated in writing by the examinee;
- (2) the person that requested the examination;
- (3) a member, or the member's agent, of a governmental agency that licenses a polygraph examiner or supervises or controls a polygraph examiner's activities;
- (4) another polygraph examiner in private consultation; or
- (5) any other person required by due process of law.

Occ. Code § 1703.306. We find that certain information in the submitted records was acquired from polygraph examinations. It does not appear that any of the exceptions in section 1703.306 apply in this case. See Open Records Decision 565 (1990) (construing predecessor statute). Accordingly, we have marked the submitted information that is confidential pursuant to section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code and must therefore be withheld pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Section 552.119 excepts from public disclosure a photograph of a peace officer² that, if released, would endanger the life or physical safety of the officer unless one of three exceptions applies. The three exceptions are: (1) the officer is under indictment or charged with an offense by information; (2) the officer is a party in a fire or police civil service hearing or a case in arbitration; or (3) the photograph is introduced as evidence in a judicial

²"Peace officer" is defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

proceeding. This section also provides that a photograph exempt from disclosure under this section may be made public only if the peace officer gives written consent to the disclosure. Open Records Decision No. 502 (1988). The submitted information includes a photograph depicting a peace officer and it does not appear that any of the exceptions are applicable. You have not informed us that the peace officer has executed any written consent to disclosure. Thus, the department must withhold the photograph depicting a peace officer, which we have marked.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure information relating to a driver's license or motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state. We note, however, section 552.130 is designed to protect the privacy interest of the individual. This office has determined that privacy rights lapse upon the death of the subject. Attorney General Opinion H-917 at 3-4 (1976); Open Records Decision No. 272 at 1 (1981). Thus, the department may not withhold information relating to a driver's license or motor vehicle title or registration of a deceased individual. We have marked the information in the submitted documents that must be withheld under section 552.130.

Finally, we note that the submitted documents contain an account number that is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code. Section 552.136 makes certain access device numbers confidential and provides in pertinent part:

(a) In this section, "access device" means a card, plate, code, account number, personal identification number, electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other telecommunications service, equipment, or instrument identifier or means of account access that alone or in conjunction with another access device may be used to:

(1) obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value;

(2) initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.

Gov't Code § 552.136. Accordingly, the department must withhold the account number that we have marked pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code.

To summarize, (1) we have marked the submitted information that must be withheld under section 552.101 and common-law privacy; (2) the social security numbers in the submitted documents may be confidential under federal law; (3) we have marked the information that must be withheld under 552.101 and constitutional privacy; (4) we have marked the information that is confidential under section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code and must

be withheld under section 552.101; (5) we have marked the information that must be withheld under section 552.119; (6) we have marked the information that must be withheld under section 552.130; and (7) we have marked the information that must be withheld under section 552.136. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Karen A. Eckerle".

Karen A. Eckerle
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KAE/sdk

Ref: ID# 172039

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Howard Swindle
Writer at Large
The Dallas Morning News
P.O. Box 655237
Dallas, Texas 75265
(w/o enclosures)